

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

No. 71-1331.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

V.

JOHN DOE,

MIKE GRAVEL, UNITED STATES SENATOR,
Intervenor, Appellant.

No. 71-1332.

SAME,

V.

SAME,

SAME.

PETITION OF INTERVENOR-APPELLANT FOR CLARIFICATION

Robert J. Reinstein
Temple University Law School
1712 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

Charles L. Fishman
633 East Capitol Street
Washington, D. C.

Attorneys for Senator Gravel

RECEIVED
U.S. ATTORNEY
JAN 1 1972
BOSTON
REFERRED

PETITION FOR CLARIFICATION

Senator Mike Gravel, intervenor-appellant, respectfully requests this Court to clarify the scope of permissible questioning of witnesses before the grand jury relative to the activities of Senator Gravel and his aides. This petition for clarification is filed because the modified Protective Order issued in the Judgment does not appear, in certain respects, to conform with holdings in the opinion.

Paragraph 1 of the modified Protective Order reads as follows:

"No witness before the grand jury currently investigating the release of the Pentagon Papers may be questioned about Senator Mike Gravel's conduct at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds on June 29, 1971, nor, if the questions are directed to the motives or purposes behind the Senator's conduct at that meeting, about any communications with him or with his aides regarding the activities of the Senator or his aides during the period of their employment, in preparation for and related to said meeting."

In our petition for rehearing, we discussed what appears to be an apparent inconsistency between the scope of questioning permitted with respect to conduct at the hearing (clause 1) and preparation for it (clause 2).

We also desire clarification with respect to the second clause, which permits inquiry into preparation "if the questions are [not] directed to the motives or purposes behind the Senator's conduct at the hearing." In the opinion (p. 12) the Court construed United States v. Johnson, 383 U.S. 169 (1966),

to prohibit inquiry into preparation "if the object is to a
the legislator's motives in speaking." (emphasis added) w
request the Court to clarify whether the grand jury is proh
from inquiry of third parties about (1) the Senator's motiv
for holding the hearing, or about (2) such motives if the p
of the inquiry is to attack them, or about (3) preparation
the hearing if that relates to his motives for holding it.

Paragraph 2 of the Protective Order provides:

"Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg may not be questioned about
his own actions while being interviewed for, or after
having been engaged as a member of Senator Gravel's
personal staff to the extent that they were in the
course of his employment."

Since the Court in the opinion stressed the necessity
preserving the confidential relationship between the Senato
and his aides, we think that, in order to bring this provis
into conformity, it should bar questioning of what aides
observed and heard, as well as did, in the course of their
employment. Otherwise, a literal reading of Paragraph 2 wo
permit questioning of an aide about the Senator's actions o
about communications from others with whom they were direct
by the Senator, to deal.

Finally, the Court mandated in the opinion (p. 13) tha
the District Court prohibit questioning of aides "relating
the Pentagon Papers or to intervenor's legislative activiti

during the period of their employment." This appears to be substantially different than Paragraph 2 above.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Reinstein
Temple University Law School
1715 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

Charles D. Fishman
632 East Capitol Street
Washington, D. C.

Attorneys for Senator Gravel